

**REMARKS**

The present invention is a mobile telecommunications device including a browser for navigating between different pages and display information therefrom; a memory that stores a program to be run by a processor to provide a browser functionality to permit a user to navigate between different network addresses and display information therefrom; a method of operating a browser in a mobile telecommunications device and a mobile telecommunications device including a browser to navigate between different network addresses. A mobile telecommunications device in accordance with an embodiment of the invention includes a browser for navigating between different pages and display information therefrom, and a key 4b operable in a first mode S6.2 to navigate between previously visited pages and operable in a second mode S6.3 to provide a display of previously visited pages whereby to permit the user to select a page from the display as illustrated in Fig. 4 from the display of previously visited pages and navigate directly thereto.

Claim 5 stands objected to regarding a recitation of "the display of previously visited home pages". The problem of antecedent basis has been corrected.

Submitted for the Examiner's consideration are amended drawings which add the legends 'Prior Art' to Figs. 1 and 2 which is understood to be what the Examiner's required correction to the drawings was to be.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has considered the "to as

to" recitation to not be clearly defined. Claim 12 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 1, 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pub. 2001/0008399 (Oosterholt et al). With respect to claims 1, 7, 10, 12 and 13, the Examiner reasons as follows:

"Oosterholt et al teach on Fig. 1, item 202 of Fig. 2, Fig. 3, section [0017], using the cursor to click history means to display visited web pages and to click the history list for navigating selected web pages.

Oosterholt et al failed to teach the clicking is performed by a same key. However, "Official Notice" is taken that using the same key (i.e., left key of a mouse) to trigger the cursor is old and well known to one skilled in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Oosterholt et al to have the clicking by the same key such that the modified system of Oosterholt et al would be able to support the system users convenience of clicking cursor by using the same key."

These grounds of rejection are traversed for the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1, 10, 12 and 13 substantively recite the operation of a key in first and second modes with the first mode permitting navigation between previously visited pages and the second mode providing a display or data corresponding to a display of previously visited pages. This subject matter provides an advantage to the user of not having to navigate through a whole sequence of pages previously visited to obtain a desired page. This permits the desired page to be easily selected from the displayed list with the user not having to tediously and laboriously review all previously displayed network addresses.

Oosterholt et al discloses in Fig. 2 a web browser which has history means 202, compilation means 203 and bookmark means 204. The compilation means as described in paragraph [0021] enables a user to compile a set of references to web pages still to be presented which compilation may be appended to a history list

which permits retrieval by the retrieval means 206. However, this does not suggest the subject matter of the claims as set forth above.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that the left key of a mouse is an example of clicking performed by a same key. However, the Examiner has disregarded the recitations of the claims which require first and second modes which involve the utilization of the same key. It is submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art understands a mode as being a manner of performing something. However, even if the same key may be used in two instances, this does not suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the key is being utilized with respect to first and second modes. If the Examiner persists in the stated grounds of rejection, it is requested that he point out on the record how he considers the claimed modes to be met by Oosterholt et al.

It is submitted that the Examiner's suggestion that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Oosterholt et al to have clicking by the same key is based upon impermissible hindsight. It is requested that the Examiner cite Prior Art demonstrating the clicking by the same key which is limited to be used in association with the claimed first and second modes. The Examiner has not demonstrated on the record that Oosterholt et al would be considered by a person of ordinary skill in the art to be relevant to the claimed first and second modes involving the same key which respectively provide for navigation between previously visited pages and a display of previously visited pages or data of previously visited pages as recited in the claims.

Claim 4 further limits claim 1 in reciting that the first and second modes are selected by operating the key for relatively shorter and longer periods respectively.

The Examiner considers the period of operating the key for each mode to be a design choice. However, it is submitted that the Examiner has not even demonstrated on the record that the left key of a mouse would be considered by a person of ordinary skill in the art to involve the claimed first and second modes. Moreover, it is further submitted that the subject matter of claim 4, where the first and second modes are selected by operating a key for shorter and longer periods respectively, is not suggested and is not merely a design choice. Such rationale is based on impermissible hindsight.

Claims 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oosterholt et al in view of USP 6,727,891 (Moriya et al). Moriya et al has been cited for a scrolling key. However, Moriya et al does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Oosterholt et al.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oosterholt et al in view of USP 6,304,746 (Fascenda et al). Fascenda et al has been cited as teaching selecting a page by using the return key on a wireless communications device. However, Fascenda et al does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Oosterholt et al.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oosterholt et al. Claim 9 is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oosterholt et al in view of USP 6,593,944 (Nicholas et al). These grounds of rejection are traversed for the following reasons.

Nicholas et al has been cited as teaching the wireless application protocol (WAP). However, Nicholas et al did not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Oosterholt et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the claims in the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that there are any other points which may be clarified or otherwise disposed of either by telephone discussion or by personal interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Docket No. 1076.40549X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP**

By   
Donald E. Stout  
Reg. No. 26,422

DES/dks

N:\1076\40549X00\AMD\BU5153.DOC

1300 North Seventeenth Street, Suite 1800  
Arlington, Virginia 22209  
Telephone: (703) 312-6600  
Facsimile: (703) 312-6666

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheet of drawings includes amendments to Figs. 1 and 2. This sheet, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 1-2. Figs. 1-2 are now reflected as Prior Art, as required by the Examiner.

Entry and acceptance of Figs. 1 and 2, as amended, is respectfully requested.